arXiv:1611.09273v1 [math.MG] 28 Nov 2016

ON POLYTOPES WITH CONGRUENT PROJECTIONS OR SECTIONS

SERGII MYROSHNYCHENKO AND DMITRY RYABOGIN

ABSTRACT. Let $2 \leq k \leq d-1$ and let P and Q be two convex polytopes in $\mathbb{E}^d$. Assume that their projections, $P|H$, $Q|H$, onto every k-dimensional subspace H, are congruent. In this paper we show that P and Q or P and $-Q$ are translates of each other. We also prove an analogous result for sections by showing that $P = Q$ or $P = -Q$, provided the polytopes contain the origin in their interior and their sections, $P \cap H$, $Q \cap H$, by every k-dimensional subspace H, are congruent.

1. Introduction

In this paper we address the following problems (cf., for example, [Ga, Problem 3.2, p. 125 and Problem 7.3, p. 289]).

Problem 1. *Let $2 \leq k \leq d-1$. Assume that K and L are convex bodies in $\mathbb{E}^d$ such that the projections $K|H$ and $L|H$ are congruent for all $H \in \mathcal{G}(d,k)$. Is K a translate of $\pm L$?*

Problem 2. *Let $2 \leq k \leq d-1$. Assume K and L are star bodies in $\mathbb{E}^d$ such that the sections $K \cap H$ and $L \cap H$ are congruent for all $H \in \mathcal{G}(d,k)$. Is $K = \pm L$?*

Here we say that $K|H$, the projection of K onto H, is congruent to $L|H$ if there exists an orthogonal transformation $\varphi \in O(k,H)$ in H such that $\varphi(K|H)$ is a translate of $L|H$; $\mathcal{G}(d,k)$ stands for the Grassmann manifold of all k-dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{E}^d$.

Golubyatnikov has obtained some partial answers to Problem 1 in the case of *direct* rigid motions, i.e., when the orthogonal group $O(k)$ is replaced by the special orthogonal group $SO(k)$. In particular, he proved that the answer is affirmative, provided $k = 2$ and none of the projections of the bodies have symmetries with respect to rotations (in other words, the only direct rigid motion taking $K|H$, $L|H$ onto themselves is the identity). We refer the reader to [Go], [Ga] (pp. $100-110$), [Ha] (pp. $126-127$), [R1], [R2], [R3] and [ACR], for history and partial results related to the above problems.

In this paper we give an affirmative answer to Problems 1 and 2 in the class of polytopes. Our first result is

Key words and phrases. Sections and projections of convex bodies.

The authors are supported in part by U.S. National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1600753.

Theorem 1. *Let $2 \le k \le d-1$ and let P and Q be two convex polytopes in $\mathbb{E}^d$ such that their projections $P|H$, $Q|H$, onto every k-dimensional subspace H, are congruent. Then there exists $b \in \mathbb{E}^d$ such that $P = Q + b$ or $P = -Q + b$.*

If projections of the bodies are *directly* congruent, Golubyatnikov proved Theorem 1 in the case $k = 2$ (the result is contained in the proof of Theorem 2.1.2, p. 19; cf. [Go], p. 17, Lemma 2.1.4), and in the case $k = 3$ under the additional assumption that none of the 3-dimensional projections have rigid motion symmetries (cf. [Go], p. 48, Theorem 3.2.1); see also [ACR], where the assumption on symmetries was relaxed.

Our second result is

Theorem 2. *Let $2 \le k \le d-1$ and let P and Q be two convex polytopes in $\mathbb{E}^d$ containing the origin in their interior. Assume that their sections, $P \cap H$, $Q \cap H$, by every k-dimensional subspace H, are congruent. Then $P = Q$ or $P = -Q$.*

If sections of the bodies are *directly* congruent Theorem 2 is known in the case $k = 2$ (cf. [AC]), and in the case $k = 3$ (cf. [ACR]) under the additional assumptions that diameters of one of the polytopes contain the origin and certain sections related to the diameters have no rigid motion symmetries.

We remark that in both Theorems it is enough to assume that only one of the bodies is a convex polytope. This follows from a result of Klee [Kl], who showed that a set in $\mathbb{E}^d$ must be a convex polytope, provided all of its projections on k-dimensional subspaces are convex polytopes. It follows by duality (see [Ga], formula (0.38), p. 22) that if all sections of a convex body containing the origin in its interior are polytopes, then the body is a polytope.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we recall some definitions for convenience of the reader. We also prove some auxiliary Lemmata that will be used in Sections 3 and 4, where we prove Theorems 1 and 2.

1.1. **Notation.** We denote by $S^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{E}^d : |x| = 1\}$ the set of all unit vectors in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^d$, and by $S^{d-1}_\zeta = \{x \in S^{d-1} : x \cdot \zeta < 0\}$ an open hemisphere in the direction $\zeta \in S^{d-1}$; O stands for the origin of $\mathbb{E}^d$. For any unit vector $\xi \in S^{d-1}$ we let $\xi^\perp$ to be the orthogonal complement of ξ in $\mathbb{E}^d$, i.e. the set of all $x \in \mathbb{E}^d$ such that $x \cdot \xi = 0$; here $x \cdot \xi$ stands for a usual scalar product of x and $\xi \in \mathbb{E}^d$. The notation for the orthogonal group $O(k)$ and the special orthogonal group $SO(k)$ is standard. The notation $\varphi_\xi \in O(d-1, \xi^\perp)$ will be used for an orthogonal transformation acting in $\xi^\perp$. We agree to denote by xy the closed interval connecting x and y, i.e. all points of the form $ty + (1-t)x, t \in [0,1]$; the shortest arc of the unit circle joining the points x and y on S^{d-1} will be denoted by $[xy]$; $span(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$ stands for the m-dimensional subspace that is a linear span of the linearly independent vectors $a_1, \dots, a_m$; $span(A)$ is the linear subspace of smallest dimension containing a set $A \subset \mathbb{E}^d$. Also, for any set $A \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ the notation $A_\xi = A|\xi^\perp$ is used for the projection of A onto $\xi^\perp$. The *shadow boundary* of a convex polytope P in direction

ξ will be denoted by $\partial_\xi P$, i.e., $\partial_\xi P = \{x \in P : x_\xi \in \partial P_\xi\}$; here ∂P_ξ stands for the boundary of the projection P_ξ. Given a set B, $\mathrm{conv}(B)$ denotes the smallets convex set containing B.

2. Definitions and Auxiliary Results

A set $A \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ is convex if for any two points x and y in A the closed line segment xy joining them is in A. A convex *body* $K \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ is a compact convex set with a non-empty interior (with respect to $\mathbb{E}^d$). A *convex polytope* $P \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ is a convex body that is a convex hull of finitely many points (called the vertices of P).

Fix $1 \le k \le d$. We say that a convex set B is a *k-dimensional convex polytope* if there exists an affine k-dimensional subspace M of $\mathbb{E}^d$ such that $B \subset M$ and B is a convex polytope relative to M (i.e., the interior of B is taken with respect to M).

We will say that a subset D of an open hemisphere S^{d-1}_ζ, $z\eta \in S^{n-1}$, is *geodesically convex*, if for any two points x and y in D the arc of the unit circle $[xy]$ joining them is in D.

We define a *rigid motion* T_ξ acting in $\xi^\perp$, $T_\xi : \xi^\perp \to \xi^\perp$, as a composition of an orthogonal transformation φ_ξ and a translation by $a_\xi \in \xi^\perp$, $T_\xi(x) = \varphi_\xi(x) + a_\xi$ for all $x \in \xi^\perp$.

The supporting hyperplane G to a convex body K is defined as the hyperplane having common points with K and such that K lies in the closed half-space with the boundary G. The *support function* of a convex body is defined as $h_K(\xi) = \max\limits_{x\in K} x \cdot \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{E}^d$.

If L is a convex body L containing the origin in the interior, its *radial function* is defined as $\rho_L(\xi) = \max\{\lambda > 0 : \lambda\xi \in L\}$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{E}^d$. Since h_K and ρ_K are homogeneous functions of degrees 1 and -1 correspondingly, it is enough to consider their values for $\xi \in S^{d-1}$, where both functions are continuous.

Our first axillary result will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider four points $A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{E}^d$, such that for an open set $U \subset S^{d-1}$ of directions ξ, $|A_\xi B_\xi| = |C_\xi D_\xi| \neq 0$. Then the intervals AB and CD are parallel and have equal length.*

Proof. Since any parallel translation preserves the length of the projections of the intervals, we may assume that $A = C = O$. Let a and b be the unit vectors of directions of AB and CD, and t and s be their lengths. In this case, the projections of B and D onto $\xi^\perp$ can be found as

$$B_\xi = ta - (\xi \cdot ta)\xi \quad \text{and} \quad D_\xi = sb - (\xi \cdot sb)\xi, \qquad \forall \xi \in U.$$

Our goal is to prove that $t = s$ and $a = b$ or $a = -b$.

The condition on the equality of the lengths of projections can be written as

$$t|a - (\xi \cdot a)\xi| = s|b - (\xi \cdot b)\xi| \qquad \forall \xi \in U,$$

or

$$t^2 - s^2 = t^2(\xi \cdot a)^2 - s^2(\xi \cdot b)^2 = (\xi \cdot (ta - sb))(\xi \cdot (ta + sb)) \qquad \forall \xi \in U.$$

We claim that the right-hand side of the above identity is not an identically constant function of ξ on the spherical cap U, unless $ta - sb = 0$ or $ta + sb = 0$. Indeed, if the claim is false, then dividing the above identity by the lengths of vectors $ta - sb$, $ta + sb$, we see that the function

$$f(\xi) = (\xi \cdot v)(\xi \cdot w), \quad v = \frac{ta - sb}{|ta - sb|}, \quad w = \frac{ta + sb}{|ta + sb|},$$

is identically constant (equal to $\frac{t^2 - s^2}{|ta - sb||ta + sb|}$) on U. For $c_1, c_2 \in (-1, 1)$ consider the level sets

$$L_v(c_1) = \{\xi \in S^{d-1} : \xi \cdot v = c_1\}, \quad L_w(c_2) = \{\xi \in S^{d-1} : \xi \cdot B = c_2\},$$

of functions $\xi \to \xi \cdot v$ and $\xi \to \xi \cdot w$. It is clear that $L_v(c_1)$, $L_w(c_2)$ are the corresponding $(d-2)$-dimensional sub-spheres of S^{d-1}. Since $v \neq \pm w$, $L_v(c_1) \neq L_w(c_2)$ $\forall c_1$, $c_2 \in (-1, 1)$, and $L_v(c_1) \cap L_w(c_2)$ is (at most) an $(d-3)$-dimensional subsphere of S^{d-1}. Taking $c_1, c_2 \in (-1, 1)$ such that $L_v(c_1) \cap L_w(c_2) \cap U \neq \emptyset$, and changing ξ in $U \cap (L_v(c_1) \setminus L_w(c_2))$, we see that $\xi \cdot v$ remains constant while $\xi \cdot w$ does not. Thus, $f(\xi)$ is not constant on U, and we obtain a contradiction. The claim is proven, and the proof of the Lemma is finished. □

The next statement shows that one may disregard the set of all directions for which at least two facets of the projections are orthogonal.

Lemma 2.2. *Let α and β be two non-parallel $(d-2)$-dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{E}^d$, such that $\dim(\alpha \cap \beta) = d - 3$. Then the set of directions $\xi \in S^{d-1} \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$, for which α_ξ is orthogonal to β_ξ, is a nowhere dense subset of S^{d-1}.*

Proof. Assume that $\alpha \cap \beta = span\{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{d-3}\}$ and $\alpha = span\{a, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-3}\}$, $\beta = span\{b, c_1, \ldots, c_{d-3}\}$, where a, b, and c_j are linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{E}^d$, $j = 1, \ldots, d-3$, $a \neq b$. By condition of the lemma, we have $\alpha_\xi = span\{a_\xi, (c_1)_\xi, \ldots, (c_{d-3})_\xi\}$, $\beta_\xi = span\{b_\xi, (c_1)_\xi, \ldots, (c_{d-3})_\xi\}$, $\alpha_\xi \cap \beta_\xi = span\{(c_1)_\xi, \ldots, (c_{d-3})_\xi\}$. Here $(c_i)_\xi = c_i - (c_i \cdot \xi)\xi$, $i = 1, \ldots, d-3$, and $a_\xi = a - (a \cdot \xi)\xi$, $b_\xi = b - (b \cdot \xi)\xi$.

Let n_{α_ξ} and n_{β_ξ} be the normal vectors to α_ξ and β_ξ in $\xi^\perp$. If $\alpha_\xi \perp \beta_\xi$, then $n_{\alpha_\xi} \perp n_{\beta_\xi}$, and, in the three-dimensional case, the condition of orthogonality $n_{\alpha_\xi} \cdot n_{\beta_\xi} = 0$ can be written as

$$a_\xi \cdot b_\xi = (a - \xi(a \cdot \xi)) \cdot (b - \xi(b \cdot \xi)) = a \cdot b - (a \cdot \xi)(b \cdot \xi) = 0.$$

To write out the condition in the case $d \geq 4$, we consider a linear transformation $A_\xi \in O(d)$, such that $A_\xi \xi = e_d = (0, \ldots, 0, 1)$. For all $\xi \in S^{d-1}$, $\xi \neq e_d$, we choose

A_ξ with the matrix

$$A_\xi = \begin{pmatrix} -1+\frac{\xi_1^2}{1-\xi_d} & \frac{\xi_1\xi_2}{1-\xi_d} & \dots & \frac{\xi_1\xi_{d-1}}{1-\xi_d} & -\xi_1 \\ -\frac{\xi_1\xi_2}{1-\xi_d} & 1-\frac{\xi_2^2}{1-\xi_d} & \dots & -\frac{\xi_2\xi_{d-1}}{1-\xi_d} & \xi_2 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -\frac{\xi_1\xi_{d-1}}{1-\xi_d} & 1-\frac{\xi_{d-1}^2}{1-\xi_d} & \dots & -\frac{\xi_{d-1}\xi_{d-1}}{1-\xi_d} & \xi_{d-1} \\ \xi_1 & \xi_2 & \dots & \xi_{d-1} & \xi_d \end{pmatrix},$$

(if we treat the i-th row r_i of A_ξ as an d-dimensional vector, then $r_i \cdot r_j = \delta_{ij}$, i, j=1, $\dots$, d). If $\xi = e_d$ we put $A_\xi = I$.

Consider now the vectors $\tilde a = \tilde a(\xi) = A_\xi a_\xi, \tilde b = \tilde b(\xi) = A_\xi b_\xi, \tilde c = \tilde c(\xi) = A_\xi c_\xi, \tilde n_{\alpha_\xi} = A_\xi n_{\alpha_\xi}, \tilde n_{\beta_\xi} = A_\xi n_{\beta_\xi}$. The condition of the normals being orthogonal is

$$\tilde n_{\alpha_\xi} \cdot \tilde n_{\beta_\xi} = n_{\alpha_\xi} \cdot n_{\beta_\xi} = 0 \qquad \xi \in S^{d-1} \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta), \tag{1}$$

where the normal vectors $\tilde n_{\alpha_\xi}, \tilde n_{\beta_\xi} \in e_d^\perp$ can be found as the generalized vector products,

$$\tilde n_{\alpha_\xi} = \begin{vmatrix} e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & \dots & e_{d-1} \\ \tilde a^1 & \tilde a^2 & \tilde a^3 & \dots & \tilde a^{d-1} \\ \tilde c_1^1 & \tilde c_1^2 & \tilde c_1^3 & \dots & \tilde c_1^{d-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \tilde c_{d-3}^1 & \tilde c_{d-3}^2 & \tilde c_{d-3}^3 & \dots & \tilde c_{d-3}^{d-1} \end{vmatrix},$$

$$\tilde n_{\beta_\xi} = \begin{vmatrix} e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & \dots & e_{d-1} \\ \tilde b^1 & \tilde b^2 & \tilde b^3 & \dots & \tilde b^{d-1} \\ \tilde c_1^1 & \tilde c_1^2 & \tilde c_1^3 & \dots & \tilde c_1^{d-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \tilde c_{d-3}^1 & \tilde c_{d-3}^2 & \tilde c_{d-3}^3 & \dots & \tilde c_{d-3}^{d-1} \end{vmatrix}.$$

Here $\tilde a^j, \tilde b^j$ stand for the j-th coordinate of the vectors $\tilde a$ and $\tilde b$, $\tilde c_i^j$ is the j-th coordinate of the vector $\tilde c_i$, and e_j, $j = 1, \dots, d-1$, are the vectors of the standard basis in $e_d^\perp$.

Notice that the j-th coordinate of the normal n_{α_ξ} is a rational function $R_j^\alpha(\xi) = \frac{P_j^\alpha(\xi)}{(1-\xi_d)^{d-2}}$ of the coordinates of ξ, where $P_j^\alpha(\xi)$ is a polynomial in coordinates of ξ. Similarly for n_{β_ξ}, i.e.

$$n_{\alpha_\xi} = (R_1^\alpha(\xi), \dots, R_{d-1}^\alpha(\xi)), \quad n_{\beta_\xi} = (R_1^\beta(\xi), \dots, R_{d-1}^\beta(\xi)).$$

Since we can choose the standard basis in $\mathbb{E}^d$ in such a way that $e_d \in n_\alpha^\perp \cup n_\beta^\perp$, we can assume that $\xi_d \neq 1$.

Multiplying each vector n_{α_ξ}, $n_\beta^\perp$ by $(1-\xi_d)^{d-2}$, we see that our condition on directions $\xi \in S^{d-1} \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta)$ for which $n_{\alpha_\xi} \cdot n_{\beta_\xi} = 0$ can be re-written as

$$f(\xi) := \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} P_l^\alpha(\xi) P_l^\beta(\xi) = 0.$$

In other words, the desired set is $D_f = Z_f \cap (S^{d-1} \setminus (\alpha \cup \beta))$, where Z_f is the set of zeros of f on S^{d-1}. By geometric considerations, f is not identically zero (it is enough to look at the directions ξ that are close to the ones that are parallel to *span* (α, β)). If the closure of D_f has a non-empty interior then Z_f has a non-empty interior, i.e., there exists a spherical cap $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(w) \subset Z_f$ of radius $\epsilon > 0$ centered at $w \in S^{d-1}$. But this is impossible, for replacing ξ_d with $\sqrt{1-\xi_1^2-\cdots-\xi_{d-1}^2}$ in the analytic expression for f, we obtain an analytic function of variables $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{d-1}$ in an open disc $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(w)|w^\perp$ centered at the origin. This contradicts the fact that the set of zeros of an analytic function of several real variables is of Lebesgue measure zero (cf. [O]).

Thus, the closure of D_f has an empty interior, which means that D_f is nowhere dense. The Lemma is proved. □

The following elementary result will be crucial in the Proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 2.3. *Let U be an open subset of S^{d-1} and let $\{l_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be four lines in $\mathbb{E}^d, d \geq 3$, not passing through the origin, such that for any $\xi \in U$ the subspace $\xi^\perp$ intersects each line at a single point $v_i(\xi)$. Assume also that $|v_1(\xi)v_2(\xi)| = |v_3(\xi)v_4(\xi)|$ for any $\xi \in U$.*

1) If l_1 and l_2 are parallel, then all four lines are parallel. In addition, there exists a translation b, such that $l_3 = l_1 + b$ and $l_4 = l_2 + b$ or $l_3 = l_2 + b$ and $l_4 = l_2 + b$.

2) If l_1 and l_2 are not parallel, then one of the following holds: $l_1 = \pm l_3, l_2 = \pm l_4$ or $l_1 = \pm l_4, l_2 = \pm l_3$.

3) If l_1 and l_2 are not parallel and $dim(span(l_1 \cup l_2)) = 3$, then one of the following holds: $l_1 = l_3, l_2 = l_4$, or $l_1 = -l_3, l_2 = -l_4$, or $l_1 = l_4, l_2 = l_3$, or $l_1 = -l_4, l_2 = -l_3$.

Proof. We start the proof with some elementary algebraic observations.

Parameterize each line $l_i(t) = b_i + ta_i$, such that $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $|a_i| = 1$ and $b_i \cdot a_i = 0$. Notice, that the choice of the directional vectors a_i is determined up to a sign, and the value of the parameter t for the points of intersection can be found from the condition $\xi \cdot (b_i + ta_i) = 0$, i.e. $v_i(\xi) = b_i - \frac{\xi \cdot b_i}{\xi \cdot a_i} a_i$. Hence, the condition of the lemma can be re-written as

$$\left| b_1 - \frac{\xi \cdot b_1}{\xi \cdot a_1} a_1 - b_2 + \frac{\xi \cdot b_2}{\xi \cdot a_2} a_2 \right| = \left| b_3 - \frac{\xi \cdot b_3}{\xi \cdot a_3} a_3 - b_4 + \frac{\xi \cdot b_4}{\xi \cdot a_4} a_4 \right|, \quad \forall \xi \in U. \tag{2}$$

In other words,

$$\frac{P_1(\xi)}{Q_1(\xi)} = \frac{P_2(\xi)}{Q_2(\xi)}, \quad \forall \xi \in U, \tag{3}$$

where

$$P_1(\xi) = |(\xi \cdot a_1)(\xi \cdot a_2)(b_1 - b_2) - (\xi \cdot b_1)(\xi \cdot a_2)a_1 + (\xi \cdot a_1)(\xi \cdot b_2)a_2|^2,$$
$$P_2(\xi) = |(\xi \cdot a_3)(\xi \cdot a_4)(b_3 - b_4) - (\xi \cdot b_3)(\xi \cdot a_4)a_3 + (\xi \cdot a_3)(\xi \cdot b_4)a_4|^2,$$
$$Q_1(\xi) = |(\xi \cdot a_1)(\xi \cdot a_2)|^2, \qquad Q_2(\xi) = |(\xi \cdot a_3)(\xi \cdot a_4)|^2,$$

and, due to the fact that $a_i \cdot b_i = 0$, the fractions above are not reducible. Hence, $P_1(\xi) = P_2(\xi)$ and $Q_1(\xi) = Q_2(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in U$. Since all polynomials are homogeneous of degree 4, we can extend P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2 to the whole space $\mathbb{E}^d$ and, by analiticity, we have $P_1(\xi) = P_2(\xi)$ and $Q_1(\xi) = Q_2(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{E}^d$.

We prove 1).

Assume that l_1 and l_2 are parallel, i.e., that $a_1 = \pm a_2$. Then $Q_1 = Q_2$ reads $(\xi \cdot a_1)^4 = (\xi \cdot a_3)^2(\xi \cdot a_4)^2$. The left-hand side of this identity is divisible by $(\xi \cdot a_1)^3$, hence the right-hand side must be divisible as well. This gives $a_1 = \pm a_3 = \pm a_4$, i.e., all four lines are parallel. Now we will use $P_1 = P_2$. It reads as

$$|(\xi \cdot a_1)^2(b_1 - b_2) - (\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2))(\xi \cdot a_1)a_1|^2 = |(\xi \cdot a_1)^2(b_3 - b_4) - (\xi \cdot (b_3 - b_4))(\xi \cdot a_1)a_1|^2,$$

or, using the fact that $a_1 \cdot (b_1 - b_2 - (b_3 - b_4)) = 0$,

$$(\xi \cdot a_1)^4(|b_1 - b_2|^2 - |b_3 - b_4|^2) + ((\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2))^2 - (\xi \cdot (b_3 - b_4))^2)(\xi \cdot a_1)^2 = 0. \tag{4}$$

We claim that $|b_1 - b_2| = |b_3 - b_4|$. If $|b_1 - b_2| \neq |b_3 - b_4|$, dividing all terms in the above expression by $(\xi \cdot a_1)^4$, we see that $(\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2))^2 - (\xi \cdot (b_3 - b_4))^2$ must be divisible by $(\xi \cdot a_1)^2$. In other words,

$$b_1 - b_2 - (b_3 - b_4) = \pm\lambda a_1, \qquad \text{or} \qquad b_1 - b_2 + b_3 - b_4 = \pm\mu a_1,$$

for some $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Since all $b_i \in a_1^\perp$, we have $\lambda = 0 = \mu = 0$, and the claim is proven.

We see now that (4) has reduced to

$$((\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2))^2 - (\xi \cdot (b_3 - b_4))^2)(\xi \cdot a_1)^2 = 0,$$

or to

$$(\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2 - (b_3 - b_4)))(\xi \cdot (b_1 - b_2 + b_3 - b_4)) = 0 \qquad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{E}^d.$$

The first part of the lemma is proven.

We prove 2).

We will consider the first four possibilities, other four options are obtained by changing indices $3 \leftrightarrow 4$. Comparing the denominators in (3), we see that $a_1 = \pm a_3$, $a_2 = \pm a_4$. Writing out the numerators in (3), we have

$$(\xi \cdot a_1)^2(\xi \cdot a_2)^2(|b_1 - b_2|^2 - |b_3 - b_4|^2) + (\xi \cdot a_2)^2((\xi \cdot b_1)^2 - (\xi \cdot b_3)^2) +$$
$$+ (\xi \cdot a_1)^2((\xi \cdot b_2)^2 - (\xi \cdot b_4)^2) -$$

$$-2(\xi\cdot a_1)(\xi\cdot a_2)^2((a_1\cdot(b_1-b_2))(\xi\cdot b_1)-(a_1\cdot(b_3-b_4))(\xi\cdot b_3))+$$
$$+2(\xi\cdot a_1)^2(\xi\cdot a_2)((a_2\cdot(b_1-b_2))(\xi\cdot b_2)-(a_2\cdot(b_3-b_4))(\xi\cdot b_4))-$$
$$-2(\xi\cdot a_1)(\xi\cdot a_2)(a_1\cdot a_2)((\xi\cdot b_1)(\xi\cdot b_2)-(\xi\cdot b_3)(\xi\cdot b_4))=0.$$

Since the second term must be divisible by $\xi\cdot a_1$ and the third one must be divisible by $\xi\cdot a_2$, we see that $b_1-b_3=\lambda_1 a_1$ or $b_1+b_3=\mu_1 a_1$ for some λ_1, $\mu_1\in\mathbb{R}$ (observe that both conditions may not hold simulteneously, for, otherwise, summing them up, we would obtain that a_1 is parallel to b_1) and $b_2-b_4=\lambda_2 a_2$ or $b_2+b_4=\mu_2 a_2$ for some λ_2, $\mu_2\in\mathbb{R}$ (again, both conditions may not hold simulteneously, otherwise a_2 would be parallel to b_2). If $b_1-b_3=\lambda_1 a_1$, then $l_1=l_3$, for, the parametric equation of l_3 becomes $l_3(t)=b_1-\lambda_1 a_1+ta_1$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$, which is the same as the one of $l_1(s)=b_1+a_1 s$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, after taking $t=\lambda_1+s$. Arguing similarly, we see that $l_1=\pm l_3$, $l_2=\pm l_4$. This finishes the proof of 2).

In order to prove 3), it remains to exclude two cases $l_1=l_3$, $l_2=-l_4$, and $l_1=-l_3$, $l_2=l_4$, provided $\dim(\mathrm{span}(l_1,l_2))=3$ (the cases obtained by changing the indices $3\leftrightarrow 4$ are excluded similarly). We will consider the first case and the exclusion of the second case is similar. To this end, assume that $a_3=a_1$, $b_3=b_1$, and $a_2=a_4$, $b_2=-b_4$. Then, condition (2) reads as

$$\left|\left(b_1-\frac{\xi\cdot b_1}{\xi\cdot a_1}a_1\right)-\left(b_2-\frac{\xi\cdot b_2}{\xi\cdot a_2}a_2\right)\right|=\left|\left(b_1-\frac{\xi\cdot b_1}{\xi\cdot a_1}a_1\right)+\left(b_2-\frac{\xi\cdot b_2}{\xi\cdot a_2}a_2\right)\right|,\ \forall\xi\in U.$$

It is satisfied only, provided

$$\left(b_1-\frac{\xi\cdot b_1}{\xi\cdot a_1}a_1\right)\cdot\left(b_2-\frac{\xi\cdot b_2}{\xi\cdot a_2}a_2\right)=0\quad\forall\xi\in U. \tag{5}$$

(Observe that (5) holds in the case $d\geq 4$, $\dim(\mathrm{span}(l_1,l_2))=4$, and $span(a_1,b_1)\perp span(a_2,b_2)$).

We show that (5) leads to a contradiction in the case $\dim(\mathrm{span}(l_1,l_2))=3$. We may assume that $d=3$. We observe that $\mathrm{span}(a_1,b_1)=\mathrm{span}(a_2,b_2)$. Passing to the common denominator in (5) and using analiticity, we have

$$(b_1\cdot b_2)(\xi\cdot a_1)(\xi\cdot a_2)-(b_1\cdot a_2)(\xi\cdot a_1)(\xi\cdot b_2)-$$
$$(a_1\cdot b_2)(\xi\cdot b_1)(\xi\cdot a_2)+(a_1\cdot a_2)(\xi\cdot b_1)(\xi\cdot b_2)=0\qquad\forall\xi\in\mathbb{E}^3.$$

We can assume that one of the numbers $b_1\cdot b_2$, $b_1\cdot a_2$, $a_1\cdot b_2$, $a_1\cdot a_2$, is not zero; without loss of generality, $b_1\cdot b_2\neq 0$. Then, the expression

$$-(a_1\cdot b_2)(\xi\cdot b_1)(\xi\cdot a_2)+(a_1\cdot a_2)(\xi\cdot b_1)(\xi\cdot b_2)$$

is divisible by $\xi\cdot a_1$, and, as a consequence,

$$\xi\cdot(b_2(a_1\cdot a_2)-a_2(a_1\cdot b_2))$$

is divisible by $\xi\cdot a_1$. This gives

$$b_2(a_1\cdot a_2)-a_2(a_1\cdot b_2)=\mu a_1 \tag{6}$$

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, since

$$(b_1 \cdot b_2)(\xi \cdot a_1)(\xi \cdot a_2) - (a_1 \cdot b_2)(\xi \cdot b_1)(\xi \cdot a_2)$$

is divisible by $\xi \cdot a_2$, the expression

$$(\xi \cdot b_2)((a_1 \cdot a_2)(\xi \cdot b_1) - (b_1 \cdot a_2)(\xi \cdot a_1))$$

is divisible by $\xi \cdot a_2$ as well, and we have

$$b_1(a_1 \cdot a_2) - (b_1 \cdot a_2)a_1 = \lambda a_2, \tag{7}$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Combining (6) and (7) together, and using the fact that a_1 is not parallel to a_2, we obtain $\operatorname{span}(a_1, b_1) = \operatorname{span}(a_2, b_2)$.

Finally, denote

$$A(\xi) = (\xi \cdot a_1)b_1 - (\xi \cdot b_1)a_1, \qquad B(\xi) = (\xi \cdot a_2)b_2 - (\xi \cdot b_2)a_2.$$

We know that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{E}^3$ these vectors belong to the same two-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{E}^3$. Using (5) and the analyticity of $A(\xi)$ and $B(\xi)$, we see that $A(\xi)\cdot\xi = 0$ and $B(\xi) \cdot \xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, i.e., $A(\xi)$ and $B(\xi)$ belong to $\xi^\perp$. Moreover, due to (5) they are orthogonal to each other. By taking $\xi \in \operatorname{span}(a_1, b_1)$, we obtain two vectors that are orthogonal and parallel to each other at the same time. Hence, at least one of them is zero, and we obtain a contradiction. The lemma is proven. □

Let P be a polytope in $\mathbb{E}^d$. To formulate our next lemma, we denote by $U = U(P) \subset S^{d-1}$ the open set of directions ξ such that $\xi^\perp$ is not passing through vertices of P.

Lemma 2.4. *Let α and β be two $(d-1)$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{E}^d$ parallel to the facets of a polytope P. Then the set of directions $\xi \in U$ such that $\xi^\perp \cap \alpha$ and $\xi^\perp \cap \beta$ are orthogonal, is a nowhere dense subset of S^{d-1}.*

Proof. We can assume that $\dim(\xi^\perp \cap \alpha) = \dim(\xi^\perp \cap \beta) = d - 2$. Consider the dual polytope P^*. It is well-known that $(P \cap \xi^\perp)^* = P^*|\xi^\perp$ (see, for instance, [Ga], formula (0.38), p. 22). By condition of the lemma, $\xi \in U$ is not parallel to any facet of P^*. Hence, the pre-image of any vertex of $P^*|\xi^\perp$ under the projection is a vertex of P^*. On the other hand, under the duality the facets of P become the vertices of P^* and the radius-vectors of the vertices of P^* are parallel to the normal vectors n_α, n_β of α and β. Hence, the vectors $(n_\alpha)_\xi$ and $(n_\beta)_\xi$ are parallel to the vertices of $P^*|\xi^\perp$, and the condition of the orthogonality of facets of the sections of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ is equivalent to $(n_\alpha)_\xi \cdot (n_\beta)_\xi = 0$. This reads as

$$(n_\alpha - (n_\alpha \cdot \xi)\xi) \cdot (n_\beta - (n_\beta \cdot \xi)\xi) = n_\alpha \cdot n_\beta - (n_\alpha \cdot \xi) \cdot (n_\beta \cdot \xi) = 0.$$

The last equation is a polynomial function of coordinates of ξ. Repeating the argument which is similar to the one from Lemma 2.2, we see that the set of directions satisfying the above condition is nowhere dense on S^{d-1}. The lemma is proven. □

We will use the well-known Minkowski theorem (see, for example, [K], Theorem 9, p. 282).

Theorem 3. *Suppose that K and L are polytopes in $\mathbb{E}^d, d \geq 2$, and suppose also that the facet unit normals $n^1, \ldots, n^l$ and corresponding facet areas $c_1, \ldots, c_l$ coincide, then K coincides with L up to a translation.*

Our last auxiliary result in this section is

Theorem 4 (see [M], Theorem 1.3)**.** *Let $2 \leq j \leq d-1$ and let f and g be two continuous real-valued functions on S^{d-1}. Assume that for any j-dimensional subspace α and some vector $a_\alpha \in \alpha$, the restrictions of f and g onto $S^{d-1} \cap \alpha$ satisfy $f(-u)+a_\alpha \cdot u = g(u) \quad \forall u \in \alpha \cap S^{d-1}$ or $f(u)+a_\alpha \cdot u = g(u) \quad \forall u \in \alpha \cap S^{d-1}$. Then there exists $b \in \mathbb{E}^d$ such that $g(u) = f(u) + b \cdot u \ \forall u \in S^{d-1}$ or $g(u) = f(-u) + b \cdot u \ \forall u \in S^{d-1}$.*

We remark also that if all a_α are zero, then $b = 0$ (see also Lemma 1 from [R2], page 3431).

3. Proof of Theorem 1

We start with the case $2 \leq k = d-1$.

3.1. **Main idea.** We will show that for all directions $\xi \in S^{d-1}$, the projections of polytopes onto $\xi^\perp$ coincide up to a translation and a reflection in the origin. This will be achieved in three steps that can be briefly sketched as follows.

Step 1. Let $Y \subset S^{d-1}$ be a closed set of directions ξ that are parallel to facets of P or Q, and let U_1 be any connected component of $U = S^{d-1} \setminus Y$. We will prove that, given any two vectors ξ_1 and ξ_2 in U_1, we have $\partial_{\xi_1} P = \partial_{\xi_2} P$ and $\partial_{\xi_1} Q = \partial_{\xi_2} Q$; see Lemma 3.1.

Step 2. We will prove that the edges of the shadow boundaries $\partial_\xi P$ and $\partial_\xi Q$, $\xi \in U$, are in a bijective correspondence. We will apply Lemma 2.1 to all corresponding edges of $\partial_\xi P$ and $\partial_\xi Q$ to conclude that they are parallel and have equal length.

Step 3. We will show that the corresponding facets of projections P_ξ and $Q_\xi = T_\xi(P_\xi)$, $\xi \in U$, are pairwise parallel. We will apply Minkowski's Theorem to conclude that P_ξ and Q_ξ, $\xi \in U$, coincide up to a translation and a reflection in the origin. Then, we will use the density argument to conclude that the last statement holds for all directions $\xi \in S^{d-1}$.

Finally, we will apply Theorem 4 with f and g being the support functions of polytopes.

3.2. **Proof.** *Step 1.* Fix any facet F of P or Q with an outer unit normal η. Any direction $\xi \in S^{d-1}$ which is parallel to F belongs to $\eta^\perp$. Since polytopes have a finite number of facets, the set Y of all such directions ξ is a union of a finite number of unit $(d-2)$-dimensional subspheres of S^{d-1}. Denote $U = S^{d-1} \setminus Y$. Since Y is closed, U is open.

Fix any $\xi \in U$. Any vertex $v_\xi \in P_\xi$ is a projection of some vertex (not an edge), otherwise ξ is parallel to some facet. The same holds for edges of P_ξ, i.e. a pre-image of any edge of P_ξ is an edge of P, otherwise ξ is parallel to some 2-dimensional face of P.

Let U_1 be any non-empty linearly connected component of U. Observe that it is contained in an open hemisphere S^{d-1}_ζ for some $\zeta \in S^{d-1}$. Note also that U_1 is geodesically convex, i.e., for any two directions ξ_1 and ξ_2 in U_1 there exists an arc $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ of a unit circle of S^{d-1} such that $[\xi_1, \xi_2] \subset U_1$. Indeed, since the boundary ∂U_1 of U_1 is a finite union of closed pieces of $(d-2)$-dimensional unit subspheres of S^{d-1}, $\partial U_1 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{j} S_k$, we see that $U_1 = S^{d-1} \cap \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite convex intersection of j half-spaces defined by hyperplanes, passing through the origin and containing S_k. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is convex, the interval $\xi_1\xi_2$ connecting ξ_1 and ξ_2 belongs to $\mathcal{H}$. The projection of this interval onto S^{d-1} is an arc $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ of the unit circle, which is contained in U_1.

We have

Lemma 3.1. *For any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U_1$ the shadow boundaries coincide $\partial_{\xi_1} P = \partial_{\xi_2} P$.*



FIGURE 1.

Proof. Assume the opposite, there exist two distinct vectors $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U_1$, such that $\partial_{\xi_1} P \neq \partial_{\xi_2} P$. Then there exists $x \in \partial_{\xi_1} P$, but $x \notin \partial_{\xi_2} P$, and we may construct two half-lines $l_1(t_1) = x + t_1\xi_1, t_1 \geq 0$, and $l_2(t_2) = x + t_2\xi_2, t_2 \geq 0$ (or $t_2 \leq 0$, if necessary) to obtain

$$l_1 \cap intP = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad l_2 \cap intP \neq \emptyset.$$

Take a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, such that the ball $B(x, \varepsilon)$ intersects only faces of P that contain x (see Figure 1). Choose $x_2 \in l_2 \cap intP \cap B(x, \varepsilon)$ and $x_1 \in l_1 \cap B(x, \varepsilon), x_1 \neq x$. Notice that $x_1 \notin \partial P$, otherwise $\frac{x_1 - x}{|x_1 - x|} \notin U$, which is not possible since ξ_1 is parallel to $\frac{x_1 - x}{|x_1 - x|}$.

We project the interval $x_1x_2 = \{tx_1 + (1-t)x_2, t \in [0,1]\}$ onto S^{d-1} and obtain an arc $\xi(t) = \frac{tx_1 + (1-t)x_2 - x}{|tx_1 + (1-t)x_2 - x|}$ of the unit circle $span\{\xi_1, \xi_2\} \cap S^{d-1}$. On the other hand, there exists a point x_0, such that $x_0 = t_0 x_1 + (1 - t_0)x_2 \in \alpha$ for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, where $\alpha \subset \partial P$ is a facet of P containing x_0. We have $\xi(t_0) \notin U_1$, which contradicts the fact that U_1 is geodesically convex. □

Step 2. Our next goal is to show that the edges of shadow boundaries $\partial_\xi P$ and $\partial_\xi Q$, $\xi \in U_1$, are in a bijective correspondence. Moreover, we will prove that the corresponding edges are parallel and have equal length.

Assume that for a fixed $\xi \in U_1$ the projection P_ξ has k vertices $\{(v_1)_\xi, (v_2)_\xi, \ldots, (v_k)_\xi\}$ which are the projections of k vertices $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_k\}$ of P. Since $T_\xi(P_\xi) = Q_\xi$, every vertex $(v_i)_\xi \in P_\xi$ is mapped onto some vertex $(\tilde{v}_j)_\xi = T_\xi((v_i)_\xi) \in Q_\xi$ and every edge of P_ξ is mapped onto some edge of Q_ξ (notice also that the pre-image of any vertex of Q_ξ is a vertex of Q and the pre-image of any edge of Q_ξ is an edge of Q). This implies that for any $\xi \in U_1$ we obtain a bijective correspondence f_ξ between the set of all vertices $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_k\}$ of the shadow boundary $\partial_\xi P$ and the set of all vertices $\{\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, ..., \tilde{v}_k\}$ of the shadow boundary $\partial_\xi Q$.

Take a closed spherical cap with a non-empty interior $W \subset U_1$. For any $\xi \in W$ we have a map $f_\xi : \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_k\} \to \{\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, ..., \tilde{v}_k\}$, such that $f_\xi(v_i) = \tilde{v}_{\sigma_\xi(i)}$, and σ_ξ is a permutation of the set $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ satisfying $(\tilde{v}_{\sigma_\xi(i)})_\xi = T_\xi((v_i)_\xi)$. The set of all such possible maps f_ξ is finite. We have

$$W = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} V_\sigma, \qquad V_\sigma = \{\xi \in W : \ f_\xi(v_i) = \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k$ is the set of all permutations of $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$.

Observe that each V_σ is a closed set (it might be empty). Indeed, let $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be a convergent sequence of points of a non-empty V_σ, and let $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} \xi_k = \xi$. We have $T_{\xi_k}((v_i)_{\xi_k}) = (\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)})_{\xi_k}$, i.e.,

$$T_{\xi_k}(v_i - (v_i \cdot \xi_k)\xi_k) = \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} - (\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} \cdot \xi_k)\xi_k, \tag{8}$$

where σ is independent of ξ_k. For each $\xi \in W$ extend the operator T_ξ acting from $\xi^\perp$ to $\xi^\perp$ to the operator $\mathbb{T}_\xi$ acting from $\mathbb{E}^d$ to $\mathbb{E}^d$ as $\mathbb{T}_\xi(a) = \Phi_\xi(a) + b_\xi$. Here $\Phi_\xi \in O(d)$ is defined as $\Phi_\xi|_{\xi^\perp} = \varphi_\xi$, $\Phi_\xi(\xi) = \xi$, where $T_\xi(a_\xi) = \varphi_\xi(a_\xi) + b_\xi$. Writing (8) in terms of $\mathbb{T}_\xi$,

$$\mathbb{T}_{\xi_k}(v_i - (v_i \cdot \xi_k)\xi_k) = \Phi_{\xi_k}(v_i) - (v_i \cdot \xi_k)\xi_k + b_{\xi_k} = \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} - (\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} \cdot \xi_k)\xi_k$$

and passing to the limit as $k \to \infty$ (by considering the corresponding subsequences if necessary), we obtain

$$\mathbb{T}_\xi((v_i)_\xi) = \Phi_\xi(v_i - (v_i \cdot \xi)\xi) + b_\xi = T_\xi((v_i)_\xi) = \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} - (\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} \cdot \xi)\xi = (\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)})_\xi.$$

This means that $\xi \in V_\sigma$ and V_σ is a closed.

By the Baire category Theorem (see, for example, [R], pages 42, 43) there exists a permutation σ_o such that the interior U_o of V_{σ_o} is non-empty. (This could be also easily seen as follows. Enumerate $\mathcal{P}_k$, and take the first set V_{σ_1}. If its interior is empty, it is nowhere dense, and for every open spherical cap $\mathcal{B}_1$ in W there exists a smaller cap $\mathcal{B}_2$ that is free of points of V_{σ_1}, $\mathcal{B}_2 \cap V_{\sigma_1} = \emptyset$. Repeat the procedure with V_{σ_2} and $\mathcal{B}_2$ instead of V_{σ_1} and $\mathcal{B}_1$. After finitely many steps, unless we meet some V_σ with a non-empty interior, we will optain a spherical cap that does not intersect W, which is impossible).

Observe that if v_i and v_j are connected by an edge $v_iv_j \subset P$, such that $(v_i)_\xi(v_j)_\xi$ is an edge of P_ξ, $\xi \in U_o$, then $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)}$ is an edge of Q. Now, we can apply Lemma 2.1 to all such pairs of edges $v_iv_j \in \partial_\xi P$ and $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)} \in \partial_\xi Q$ for any $\xi \in U_o \subset S^{d-1}$. We see that these edges are parallel and have equal length. Thus, all corresponding edges belonging to the shadow boundaries $\partial_\xi P$ and $\partial_\xi Q$, $\xi \in U_o$, are parallel and have equal lengths. Applying Lemma 3.1, we conclude that the last statements holds for U_1 instead of U_o.

Step 3. We will show that the projections of both polytopes in the directions of U_1 coincide up to a translation and a reflection in the origin. To do this, we will use Minkowski's Theorem about uniqueness (up to a translation) of polytopes with parallel facets having the same volume. Our polytopes will be P_ξ and Q_ξ, $\xi \in U_1$.

Fix any $\xi \in U_1$. Then P_ξ and Q_ξ are two $(d-1)$-dimensional polytopes in $\xi^\perp$, such that $T_\xi(P_\xi) = Q_\xi$. Since the map T_ξ is a bijection between the sets of all facets of P_ξ and Q_ξ, for any facet α of P_ξ there exists a unique facet $\tilde{\alpha}$ of Q_ξ such that $T_\xi(\alpha) = \tilde{\alpha}$.

We will show at first that α is parallel to $\tilde{\alpha}$. Consider the $(d-2)$-dimensional affine subspaces Π, $\tilde{\Pi}$ of $\xi^\perp$ such that $\alpha \subset \Pi$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \subset \tilde{\Pi}$. We claim that $\tilde{\Pi}$ is parallel to Π. In other words, the outer unit normals n_α, $n_{\tilde{\alpha}} \in \xi^\perp$ of Π and $\tilde{\Pi}$ satisfy $n_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \pm n_\alpha$.

To prove the claim, observe that there exist $d-2$ linearly independent non-zero directional vectors $\{(a_1)_\xi, \dots, (a_{d-2})_\xi\}$ of edges of α having the common vertex, such that $span\{(a_1)_\xi, \dots, (a_{d-2})_\xi\}$ is parallel to Π (here, a directional vector of an edge is any non-zero vector parallel to the edge). The directional vectors of edges $\{(a_1)_\xi, \dots, (a_{d-2})_\xi\}$ are the projections of directional vectors of the edges $\{a_1, \dots, a_{d-2}\} \subset \partial_\xi P$. The directional vectors $\{\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_{d-2}\} \subset \partial_\xi Q$ of the corresponding edges are parallel, i.e. a_i is parallel to $\tilde{a}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d-2$. The same holds true for their projections onto $\xi^\perp$, $(a_i)_\xi$ is parallel to $(\tilde{a}_i)_\xi$ for $i = 1, \dots, d-2$. We conclude that for the $(d-2)$-dimensional affine subspace $\tilde{\Pi}$ containing $\tilde{\alpha}$ we have

$T_\xi(\Pi) = \tilde{\Pi}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}$ is parallel to $span\{(\tilde{a}_1)_\xi, \dots, (\tilde{a}_{d-2})_\xi\} = span\{(a_1)_\xi, \dots, (a_{d-2})_\xi\}$. The claim is proved.

Since T_ξ is an isometry, we have $\mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(\alpha) = \mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(\tilde{\alpha})$. Now assume that both polytopes P_ξ and Q_ξ have l facets $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^l \subset P_\xi$ and $\{\tilde{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^l \subset Q_\xi$ with corresponding outer normals $\{n_i\}_{i=1}^l$ and $\{\tilde{n}_i\}_{i=1}^l$. We will show that up to a nowehere dense subset of directions ξ (defined below) the projections P_ξ and Q_ξ are translates of each other (up to a reflection in the origin). To be able to apply Minkowski's Theorem to P_ξ and Q_ξ (or $-P_\xi$ and Q_ξ) we have to show that $n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, or $-n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$.

Assume that the last statement is not true, and let $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \subset P_\xi$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i, \tilde{\alpha}_j \subset Q_\xi$, be two pairs of facets such that $\alpha_i \cap \alpha_j \neq \emptyset$, $T_\xi(\alpha_i) = \tilde{\alpha}_i$, $T_\xi(\alpha_j) = \tilde{\alpha}_j$, but $\tilde{n}_i = n_i, \tilde{n}_j = -n_j$, (since T_ξ is an isometry, $\tilde{\alpha}_i \cap \tilde{\alpha}_j \neq \emptyset$). Consider two cases, $n_i \cdot n_j \neq 0$ and $n_i \cdot n_j = 0$. The first case $n_i \cdot n_j \neq 0$ is impossible, for

$$n_i \cdot (-n_j) = \tilde{n}_i \cdot \tilde{n}_j = \varphi_\xi(n_i) \cdot \varphi_\xi(n_j) = \varphi_\xi^T \varphi_\xi(n_i) \cdot n_j = n_i \cdot n_j,$$

yields $n_i \cdot n_j = 0$. Here φ_ξ^T stands for the transpose operator of φ_ξ, and we used the fact that $\varphi_\xi^T \varphi_\xi = I$ due to $\varphi_\xi \in O(d-1, \xi^\perp)$.

To exclude the case $n_i \cdot n_j = 0$, we recall that the pre-image of any facet of P_ξ or Q_ξ is an $(d-2)$-dimensional face of P or Q respectively. We apply Lemma 2.2 to the pairs of subspaces that are parallel to all pairs of $(d-2)$-dimensional faces of P and Q. We obtain a closed nowhere dense subset $Y_1 \subset U$, such that the normals of the corresponding facets of P_ξ and Q_ξ, $\xi \in Y_1$, are orthogonal. Now we may repeat our considerations for the case $n_i \cdot n_j \neq 0$ on $U_1 \setminus Y_1$ instead of U_1. We obtain that for every $\xi \in U_1 \setminus Y_1$ only one of the choices $n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, or $-n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, holds.

We conclude that for all $\xi \in U_1 \setminus Y_1$, we have $n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, or $-n_i = \tilde{n}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$. Also, recall that $c_i = \tilde{c}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, where $c_i = \mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(\alpha_i)$, $\tilde{c}_i = \mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(\tilde{\alpha}_i)$; now we may apply Theorem 3 to P_ξ and Q_ξ or to $-P_\xi$ and Q_ξ.

Thus, for every $\xi \in U_1 \setminus Y_1$ there exists a vector $b_\xi \in \xi^\perp$, such that $Q_\xi = P_\xi + b_\xi$ or $Q_\xi = -P_\xi + b_\xi$. We can repeat the above argument for every connected component of U. We see that for every $\xi \in U \setminus Y_1$ the supporting functions h_P and h_Q satisfy

$$h_Q(u) = h_P(u) + b_\xi \cdot u \quad \text{for any} \quad u \in \xi^\perp, \tag{9}$$

or

$$h_Q(u) = h_P(-u) + b_\xi \cdot u \quad \text{for any} \quad u \in \xi^\perp. \tag{10}$$

Here we used the fact that $h_{P_\xi}(u) = h_P(u)\ \forall u \in \xi^\perp$, see ([Ga], (0.21), p.17).

It is not difficult to see that one of the above equalities (or both) hold for every $\xi \in S^{d-1}$. Indeed, since $Y \cup Y_1$ is nowhere dense on S^{d-1}, for any open neighborhood $V_\xi \subset S^{d-1}$ of any $\xi \in Y \cup Y_1$ we have $V_\xi \cap U \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists a sequence $\{\xi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset U$, such that $\lim_{k \to \infty} \xi_k = \xi$. By taking a convergent subsequence if

necessary, we conclude that (the argument is very similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 6, p. 3435, [R2]) there exists a limit $\lim_{k\to\infty} b_{\xi_k} = b_\xi \in \xi^\perp$ for $\xi \in Y \cup Y_1$, such that (9) or (and) (10) holds.

To finish the proof in the case $k = d-1$, we apply Theorem 4 with $j = k$, and $f = h_P$, $g = h_Q$. We obtain that there exists $b \in \mathbb{E}^d$ such that $h_Q(u) = h_P(u) + b \cdot u$ for all $u \in \mathbb{E}^d$, or $h_Q(u) = h_P(-u) + b \cdot u$ for all $u \in \mathbb{E}^d$. Using the well-known properties of the support functions ([Ga], pp. 16-18) we obtain the desired result in the case $k = d-1$.

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 1 in the case** $2 \le k < d-1$**.** We use induction on k. Let H be any $(k+2)$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{E}^d$. We apply the result for $d = k+1$ to the bodies $P|H$ and $Q|H$ and their projections $(P|H)|J$ and $(Q|H)|J$ for all $(k+1)$-dimensional subspaces $J \subset H$. We obtain that $P|H = Q|H + b_H$ or $P|H = -Q|H + b_H$ for all H. We proceed and the result follows after finitely many steps. The proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

4. Proof of Theorem 2

We start with the case $2 \le k = d-1$.

4.1. **Main idea.** We will show that for all directions $\xi \in S^{d-1}$, the sections of polytopes by $\xi^\perp$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin. This will be achieved in four steps, which can be briefly described as follows.

Step 1. Let $Y \subset S^{d-1}$ be a closed set of directions ξ for which $\xi^\perp$ contains any of the vertices of P or Q, and let U_1 be any connected component of $U = S^{d-1} \setminus Y$. We will prove that given any two directions ξ_1 and ξ_2 in U_1, the subspaces $\xi_1^\perp$ and $\xi_2^\perp$ intersect the same set of edges of P (and Q); see Lemma 4.1.

Denote by $E = E(U_1)$ and $\tilde{E} = \tilde{E}(U_1)$ the sets of edges of P and Q that are intersected by $\xi^\perp$, $\xi \in U_1$. Denote also by $L = L(U_1)$ and $\tilde{L} = \tilde{L}(U_1)$ the sets of lines containing the intersected edges from E and $\tilde{E}$.

Step 2. We will prove that there exists an open non-empty subset U_o of U_1 such that for all directions $\xi \in U_o$ all rigid motions T_ξ "look alike". More precisely, for all $\xi \in U_o$ and for any $l_i \in L$ the vertices $v_i(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap l_i$ of sections $P \cap \xi^\perp$ are all mapped into the vertices of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ of the form $\tilde{v}_{j(i)}(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_{j(i)}$, where the line $\tilde{l}_{j(i)} \in \tilde{L}$ is fixed and $j = j(i)$ is independent of ξ.

Step 3. Using Lemma 2.3 we will show that the corresponding lines in L and $\tilde{L}$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin.

Step 4. We will apply Minkowski's Theorem to the facets of the sections $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ and will prove that for any $\xi \in S^{d-1}$ these sections coincide up to translation and a reflection in the origin. Next, using *Step 3* we will show that the sections coincide up to a reflection in the origin.

Finally, we will apply Theorem 4 with $j = d-1$, $a_\alpha = 0$, $b = 0$, and f and g being the radial functions of polytopes.

4.2. **Proof.** *Step 1.* Consider any vertex v of P or Q. If a hyperplane $\xi^\perp$ contains v then $\xi \cdot v = 0$. Hence, the set of all such directions ξ is a sub-sphere $v^\perp \cap S^{d-1}$. Since both polytopes have a finite number of vertices, the union Y of all such sub-spheres is closed, hence its complement $U = S^{d-1} \setminus Y$ is open in S^{d-1}.

Fix any connected component U_1 of U.

Lemma 4.1. *For any two distinct vectors $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U_1$, the hyperplanes $\xi_1^\perp$ and $\xi_2^\perp$ intersect the same set of edges of P.*

Proof. Let A_i be the set of all interiors of all edges of P that have non-empty intersections with $\xi_i^\perp$, $i = 1, 2$. We claim that $A_1 = A_2$.

Assume that $A_1 \neq A_2$ (see Figure 2). Then, there exists an edge xy such that $xy \cap \xi_2^\perp = \emptyset$, $xy \cap \xi_1^\perp = z$, for some point $z \in xy$. Assume also that $xy \subset l$, where l is a line $l(s) = b + sa$, $a, b \in \mathbb{E}^d$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. To prove the claim consider a continuous path $\xi(t)$ along the shortest arc $[\xi_1\xi_2] \subset U_1$, such that $\xi_1 = \xi(0)$, $\xi_2 = \xi(1)$ (since U_1 is geodesically convex, $[\xi_1\xi_2] \in U_1$). For any $t \in (0, 1)$ the intersection of $\xi(t)$ with l can be found as $r(t) = b - \frac{\xi(t)\cdot b}{\xi(t)\cdot a}a$, such that $z = b - \frac{\xi(0)\cdot b}{\xi(0)\cdot a}a$ and $b - \frac{\xi(1)\cdot b}{\xi(1)\cdot a}a \notin xy$ (if $\xi_2 \cdot a = \xi(1)\cdot a = 0$ take $\xi_2 = \xi(1-\delta)$ and consider the point $b - \frac{\xi(1-\delta)\cdot b}{\xi(1-\delta)\cdot a}a \notin xy$ for some $\delta > 0$ small enough). Since $r(t)$ is continuous, there exists t_0, such that $r(t_0) = x$ (or y). This would imply that $\xi(t_0) \in Y$, which leads to a contradiction. □



FIGURE 2. The sets $A_1 = \{xy, yw, wu, ux\}$, $A_2 = \{uw, ux, uy\}$.

Step 2. For any $\xi \in U_1$ the vertices v_i of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ are the intersections of $\xi^\perp$ with lines $l_i \in L$ and the vertices $\tilde{v}_i$ of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ are the intersections of $\xi^\perp$ with lines $\tilde{l}_i \in \tilde{L}$. Since the rigid motion T_ξ maps the vertices of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ onto the vertices of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$,

there exists a one to one correspondence between these sets of vertices. Hence, there also exists a one to one correspondence between the lines in L and $\tilde{L}$.

Let $L = \{l_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and $\tilde{L} = \{\tilde{l}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then for every $\xi \in U_1$, the rigid motion T_ξ maps any vertex $v_i(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap l_i$ of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ into the vertex $\tilde{v}_j(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_j$ of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$, $j = j(i,\xi)$. Hence, there is a permutation $\sigma_\xi \in \mathcal{P}_k$ of the set $\{1,\dots,k\}$ and the map $f_\xi : L \to \tilde{L}$ such that $f_\xi(l_i) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma_\xi(i)}$, $\sigma_\xi(i) = j(i,\xi)$.

We claim that there exists an open non-empty subset U_o of U_1 and a fixed permutation $\sigma = \sigma(U_o) \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

$$f_\xi(l_i) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} \qquad \forall \xi \in U_o, \qquad \forall i = 1,\dots,k. \tag{11}$$

Take a closed spherical cap with a non-empty interior $W \subset U_1$. The set of all possible maps f_ξ is finite. Hence,

$$W = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_k} V_\sigma, \qquad V_\sigma = \{\xi \in W : \ f_\xi(l_i) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} \quad \forall i = 1,\dots,k\}.$$

Observe each V_σ is a closed set (it might be empty). Indeed, let $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be a convergent sequence of points of a non-empty V_σ, and let $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} \xi_k = \xi$. Then $f_{\xi_k}(l_i) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$. In other words, for the corresponding vertices $v_i(\xi_k)$ and $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi_k)$ we have

$$T_\xi(v_i(\xi_k)) = \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi_k), \qquad v_i(\xi_k) = l_i \cap \xi_k^\perp, \quad \tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi_k) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} \cap \xi_k^\perp, \tag{12}$$

where σ is independent of ξ_k. Arguing as in the case of projections (see *Step 2)* in the proof of Theorem 1), we extend the rigid motion $T_\xi : \xi^\perp \to \xi^\perp$ to the one acting on the whole space $\mathbb{T}_\xi : \mathbb{E}^d \to \mathbb{E}^d$, $\xi \in W$, by the formula $\mathbb{T}_\xi(a) = \Phi_\xi(a) + b_\xi$. Here $\Phi_\xi \in O(d)$ is defined as $\Phi_\xi|_{\xi^\perp} = \varphi_\xi$, $\Phi_\xi(\xi) = \xi$, where $T_\xi(a_\xi) = \varphi_\xi(a_\xi) + b_\xi$. Writing (12) in terms of $\mathbb{T}_\xi$ we have

$$\mathbb{T}_{\xi_k}(l_i \cap \xi_k^\perp) = \Phi_{\xi_k}(l_i \cap \xi_k^\perp - l_i \cap \xi^\perp) + \Phi_{\xi_k}(l_i \cap \xi^\perp) + b_{\xi_k} = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} \cap \xi_k^\perp.$$

Now we pass to the limit in the last equality as $k \to \infty$ (taking the subsequences if necessary), and using the fact that the norms of Φ_{ξ_k} are uniformly bounded, we obtain

$$T_\xi(l_i \cap \xi^\perp) = \mathbb{T}_\xi(l_i \cap \xi^\perp) = \Phi_\xi(l_i \cap \xi^\perp) + b_\xi = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} \cap \xi^\perp.$$

Hence, $f_\xi(l_i) = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$ and $\xi \in V_\sigma$. This means that V_σ is a closed.

By the Baire category Theorem (we argue as in *Step 2)* in the proof of Theorem 1) there exists a permutation σ_o such that the interior $\mathrm{int}(V_{\sigma_o})$ is non-empty. Hence, (11) holds with $\sigma = \sigma_o$ and $U_o = \mathrm{int}(V_{\sigma_o})$.

Step 3. By Lemma 4.1 the set of edges intersected by $\xi^\perp$, $\xi \in U_o$, coincides with the set of edges intersected by $\xi^\perp$, $\xi \in U_1$. To show that the corresponding lines in L and $\tilde{L}$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin, we will consider two cases: at least two lines in L are not parallel, or all lines in L are parallel.

Let $\xi \in U_o$ and let σ be as in (11). If at least two lines from L, say l_1, l_2, are not parallel, we apply the second part of Lemma 2.3 to the pair of lines (l_1, l_2) with vertices $v_1(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap l_1$, $v_2(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap l_2$ and the corresponding pair of lines $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(1)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(2)}) \in \tilde{L}$ with vertices $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(1)}(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_{\sigma(1)}$, $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(2)}(\xi) = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_{\sigma(2)}$. We see that the lines coincide up to a reflection in the origin. Considering all corresponding pairs of pairwise non-parallel lines (l_1, l_j) and $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(1)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$ (or (l_2, l_j) and $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(2)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$), $j = 3, 4, \ldots, k$, with the corresponding vertices, we conclude that the lines from L and $\tilde{L}$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin. In other words, for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, $l_j = \pm\tilde{l}_j$.

Suppose now that for all $\xi \in U_o$, $\xi^\perp$ intersects only parallel lines in L. First, we will show that there exists $b \in \mathbb{E}^d$ such that

$$\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} = l_i + b \qquad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k. \tag{13}$$

Second, we will prove that $b = 0$ or $l_i = -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

To prove (13) we let l_i and l_m be any two parallel lines from L. Applying the first part of Lemma 2.3 to $(l_i, l_m) \in L$, $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(m)}) \in \tilde{L}$, and the corresponding vertices, we see that the lines $\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(m)}$ are parallel and $\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)} = l_i + b, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(m)} = l_m + b$, for some $b \in \mathbb{E}^d$ (up to a change of indices $i \leftrightarrow m$).

Consider now a triplet of lines l_i, l_j, and l_m, such that two two-dimensional faces of P have a common edge contained in l_i and they have other parallel edges contained in l_j and l_m. Let $\xi \in U_o$. If v_i are the vertices of $P \cap \xi^\perp$, then the vertices $\tilde{v}_i = T_\xi(v_i)$, $\tilde{v}_j = T_\xi(v_j)$, and $\tilde{v}_m = T_\xi(v_m)$ of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ should belong to the edges of Q. Moreover, due to the congruence of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ the edge containing $\tilde{v}_i$ should be common to the corresponidng two-dimensional faces of Q. We apply the first part of Lemma 2.3 to the pairs (l_i, l_j) and $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$ and to the corresponding vertices. Observe that the line l_i must be translated by the same vector in both pairs (l_i, l_m) and (l_i, l_j), otherwise the pair of lines $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(m)})$ is not a translation of the pair (l_j, l_m), which contradicts the first part of Lemma 2.3. Hence, $\tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)} = l_j + b$, where b is the same as for the pairs (l_i, l_m), $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(m)})$. Taking the corresponing triplets of lines in L and $\tilde{L}$ after finitely many steps we have (13).

Now we claim that $b = 0$ or $l_i = -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Let l_i be any line among the parallel lines in L. Consider all edges of P that have a common vertex q with $w_i \subset l_i$, say, w_p, $p = 1, \ldots, s(i)$. Consider also all lines l_p containing w_p, and let $U_{i,p}$ be the corresponding connected component of U for which $\xi^\perp$ intersect l_i and l_p, for all $\xi \in U_{i,p}$. Observe that $\dim(\mathrm{span}(l_i, l_p)) = 3$, $\forall p = 1, \ldots, s(i)$. We apply the third part of Lemma 2.3 to the pairs (l_i, l_p) and $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(p)})$ and the corresponding vertices $v_i = \xi^\perp \cap l_i$, $v_p = \xi^\perp \cap l_p$ and $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)} = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$, $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(p)} = \xi^\perp \cap \tilde{l}_{\sigma(p)}$. Here the lines l_i and $\tilde{l}_i$ belong to the corresponding sets of lines $L(U_{i,p})$ and $\tilde{L}(U_{i,p})$ and σ is the fixed permutation analogous to the one in (11).

If Lemma 2.3 yields $l_i = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$, $l_p = \tilde{l}_{\sigma(p)}$, for all $p = 1, \dots, s(i)$, we claim that $b = 0$. Indeed, in this case both polytopes P and Q have a common solid angle A_q containing q. Let $H \supset l_i$, $H \cap P = w_i$, be a supporting hyperplane to both P and Q with an inner (with respect to P) unit normal n_H. We will consider two cases, $n_H \cdot b > 0$ and $n_H \cdot b < 0$, and show that both are impossible (by changing H slightly we can assume that $n_H \cdot b \neq 0$). By (13), $P \subset \mathrm{conv}(l_1, \dots, l_k)$ and $Q \subset \mathrm{conv}(l_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, l_{\sigma(k)}) = b + \mathrm{conv}(l_1, \dots, l_k)$. If $n_H \cdot b > 0$, then Q should lie in the translated half-space $\mathcal{H} + b$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the half-space with boundary H containing P and Q. Since Q contains w_i this is impossible, unless $b = 0$. If $n_H \cdot b < 0$, then Q contains A_q and $w_i + b$, which contradicts the convexity of Q. Hence, $b = 0$.

If for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ there exists $p = p(i)$, $p = 1, \dots, s(i)$, such that Lemma 2.3 yields $l_i = -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$, $l_p = -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(p)}$, we have $l_i = -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, the corresponding lines from L and $\tilde{L}$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin.

Step 4. We will show at first that the corresponding facets of the sections $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $Q \cap \xi^\perp$, or the facets of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $-Q \cap \xi^\perp$, $\xi \in U$, satisfy the conditions of Minkowski Theorem.

Consider any section $P \cap \xi^\perp$, $\xi \in U_1$, and let (l_i, l_j) be a pair of lines in L such that $v_i v_j$ is an edge of $P \cap \xi^\perp$. Since the edge $v_i v_j$ is obtained as an intersection of $\xi^\perp$ with the two-dimensional face of P, we have $\dim(\mathrm{span}(l_i, l_j)) = 3$. Let σ be a permutation from (11). Applying the first or the third part of Lemma 2.3 to the pairs of lines (l_i, l_j) and $(\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$ (depending on whether they are parallel or not) and to the corresponding vertices $v_i(\xi)$, $v_j(\xi)$, $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi)$, $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)}(\xi)$, $\xi \in U_o$, we know that $(l_i, l_j) = (\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, \tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$ or $(l_i, l_j) = (-\tilde{l}_{\sigma(i)}, -\tilde{l}_{\sigma(j)})$ (up to a change of indices $i \leftrightarrow j$). Hence, for any $\xi \in U_1$, the edge $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi)\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)}(\xi)$ of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ satisfy $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi)\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)}(\xi) = v_i(\xi)v_j(\xi)$ or $\tilde{v}_{\sigma(i)}(\xi)\tilde{v}_{\sigma(j)}(\xi) = -v_i(\xi)v_j(\xi)$. In either case, the vectors that are parallel to these edges are preserved up to a sign.

Now consider a facet α of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and the corresponding facet $\tilde{\alpha} = T_\xi(\alpha)$ of $Q \cap \xi^\perp$. Since the pairs of the corresponding parallel edges contained in α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin, the $(d-2)$-dimensional affine planes containing the corresponding facets α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ are parallel. In addition, $\mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(T_\xi(\alpha)) = \mathrm{vol}_{d-2}(\alpha)$. To be able to apply Minkowski's Theorem we need to show that all outer normals to the corresponding parallel facets of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $Q \cap \xi^\perp$ coincide or all are opposite (in the last case we will consider the facets of $P \cap \xi^\perp$ and $-Q \cap \xi^\perp$).

By Lemma 2.4 the set Y_1 of directions for which the outer normal vectors of at least two facets of sections are orthogonal, is nowhere dense on S^{d-1}. Hence, arguing as in the case of projections we see that for all $\xi \in U_1 \setminus Y_1$ we may apply Minkowski Theorem to obtain that

$$Q \cap \xi^\perp = P \cap \xi^\perp + b_\xi, \quad \text{for some} \quad b_\xi \in \xi^\perp \tag{14}$$

or

$$Q \cap \xi^\perp = -P \cap \xi^\perp + b_\xi, \quad \text{for some} \quad b_\xi \in \xi^\perp. \tag{15}$$

We claim that (14) is possible only provided $P\cap\xi^\perp+b_\xi{=}{-}P\cap\xi^\perp$ or $b_\xi=0$ (similarly, (15) is possible only provided $-P\cap\xi^\perp+b_\xi{=}P\cap\xi^\perp$ or $b_\xi=0$).

To prove the claim, we notice that if all corresponding lines in L and $\tilde L$ are reflections of each other, then $P\cap\xi^\perp=-Q\cap\xi^\perp$ (in this case the corresponding vertices of the sections are reflections of each other). By *Step 3* the lines in L and $\tilde L$ coincide up to a reflection in the origin, hence, *all* corresponding lines are reflections of each other, provided $L\cap\tilde L=\emptyset$. We will show that if $L\cap\tilde L\neq\emptyset$ then all corresonding lines in L and $\tilde L$ are reflections in the origin of each other as well.

Let $b_\xi\neq 0$. Consider the sets $\mathcal{V}_P=\mathcal{V}_P(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{V}_Q=\mathcal{V}_Q(\xi)$ of all vertices of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ an $Q\cap\xi^\perp$, $\xi\in U_1$. The set $\mathcal{V}_P$ is the union of $\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{V}_{L\setminus\tilde L}(\xi)$, where $\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}$ is the set of vertices of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ belonging to $L\cap\tilde L$ and $\mathcal{V}_{L\setminus\tilde L}$ is the set of vertices of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ belonging to $L\setminus\tilde L$. Similarly, the set $\mathcal{V}_Q$ is the union of $\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde L\setminus L}(\xi)$, where and $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde L\setminus L}$ is the set of vertices of $Q\cap\xi^\perp$ belonging to $\tilde L\setminus L$. We have to show that $\mathcal{V}_P=-\mathcal{V}_Q$.

We will prove at first that the set $\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}$ is invariant under the reflection in the origin. Let $v\in\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}$ be any vertex. Then $v=l\cap\xi^\perp$, $l\in L\cap\tilde L$, is the vertex of $Q\cap\xi^\perp$ and $P\cap\xi^\perp$. By (14), $v-b_\xi$ is the vertex of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ and the line $\hat l\ni v-b_\xi$ is in $L\setminus\tilde L$ (if $\hat l\in L\cap\tilde L$ again, then $v-2b_\xi$ is the vertex of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ and the segment joining v and $v-2b_\xi$ is in $P\cap\xi^\perp$, hence $v-b_\xi$ is not the vertex). By *Step 3* there must be a line $-\hat l\in\tilde L$ and $-v+b_\xi\in-\hat l$ is the vertex of $Q\cap\xi^\perp$. By (14) $-v$ is also a vertex of $P\cap\xi^\perp$. Similarly, by (14) $v+b_\xi$ must be a vertex of $Q\cap\xi^\perp$ and $-v-b_\xi$ is a vertex of $P\cap\xi^\perp$ (for, $v+b_\xi$ must belong to the line in $\tilde L\setminus L$), hence $-v$ is the vertex of $Q\cap\xi^\perp$. Thus, $-v$ is the vertex of both $P\cap\xi^\perp$ and $Q\cap\xi^\perp$ and $-v\in\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}$.

By *Step 3*, for every vertex $v\in\mathcal{V}_P$ there exists a vertex $\tilde v\in\mathcal{V}_Q$ such that $\tilde v=\pm v$. Since $\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}{=}-\mathcal{V}_{L\cap\tilde L}$, we obtain $\mathcal{V}_{L\setminus\tilde L}{=}-\mathcal{V}_{\tilde L\setminus L}$, and $\mathcal{V}_P=-\mathcal{V}_Q$. We proved that if $b_\xi\neq 0$ then $P\cap\xi^\perp=-Q\cap\xi^\perp$. This means that (14) is possible only provided $P\cap\xi^\perp+b_\xi{=}{-}P\cap\xi^\perp$ or $b_\xi=0$. The claim is proved (to show that (15) is possible only provided $-P\cap\xi^\perp+b_\xi{=}P\cap\xi^\perp$ or $b_\xi=0$ it is enough to consider P and $-Q$ instead of P and Q). Thus,

$$P\cap\xi^\perp=Q\cap\xi^\perp\quad\text{or}\quad P\cap\xi^\perp=-Q\cap\xi^\perp\qquad\forall\xi\in U_1\setminus(Y\cup Y_1).\tag{16}$$

The proof of *Step 4* is finished.

Repeating similar considerations for all connected components of U, we see that (16) holds for $\xi\in U$.

We have shown that for all $\xi\in U\setminus(Y\cup Y_1)$, we have $\rho_P(u)=\rho_Q(u)$ for all $u\in\xi^\perp$ or $\rho_P(-u)=\rho_Q(u)$ for all $u\in\xi^\perp$. Since the radial functions are continuous we can prove that the same holds for any $\xi\in Y\cup Y_1$, and hence for all $\xi\in S^{d-1}$. Finally, we can apply Theorem 4 with $j=d-1$, $a_\alpha=0$, to conclude that $\rho_P(u)=\rho_Q(u)$ for all $u\in S^{d-1}$ or $\rho_P(u)=\rho_Q(-u)$ for all $u\in S^{d-1}$. Theorem 2 is proved in the case $k=d-1$.

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 2 in the case** $2 \leq k < d-1$**.** We use induction on k. Let H be any $(k+2)$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{E}^d$. We apply the result for $d = k+1$ to the bodies $P \cap H$ and $Q \cap H$ and their sections $(P \cap H) \cap J$ and $(Q \cap H) \cap J$ for all $(k+1)$-dimensional subspaces $J \subset H$. We obtain that $P \cap H = Q \cap H$ or $P \cap H = -Q \cap H$ for all H. We proceed and the result follows after finitely many steps. The proof of Theorem 2 is finished.

References

[AC] M. Alfonseca and M. Cordier, *Counterexamples related to rotations of shadows of convex bodies*, Indiana Math. J., to appear.

[ACR] M. Alfonseca, M. Cordier, D. Ryabogin, *On bodies with directly congruent projections and sections*, accepted to Israel J. Math.

[Ga] R. J. Gardner, *Geometric tomography, Second edition*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, **58** (2006), Cambridge University Press.

[Go] V. P. Golubyatnikov, *Uniqueness questions in reconstruction of multidimensional objects from tomography type projection data*, *Inverse and Ill-posed problems series*, Utrecht-Boston-Koln-Tokyo, 2000.

[Ha] H. Hadwiger, *Seitenrisse konvexer Körper und Homothetie*, Elem. Math., **18** (1963), pp. 97-8.

[K] Daniel A. Klain, The Minkowski problem for polytopes, Advances in Math., **185** (2004), pp. 270–288.

[Kl] V.L. Klee, Some characterizations of convex polyhedra, Acta Math., **102** (1959), pp. 79-107.

[M] S. Myroshnychenko, On a functional equation related to a pair of hedgehogs with congruent projections, JMAA, to appear.

[O] Mathoverflow, http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/1322858/zeros-of-analytic-function-of-several-real-variables

[R] W. Rudin, Functional Analysis, second ed., McGraw-Hill International Editions, 1991.

[R1] Ryabogin, D., *On symmetries of projections and sections of convex bodies*, Springer Contributed Volume "Discrete Geometry and Symmetry" dedicated to Karoly Bezdek and Egon Schulte on the occasion of their 60-th birthdays, to appear.

[R2] Ryabogin, D., *On the continual Rubik's cube*, Adv. Math., **231** (2012), pp. 3429-3444.

[R3] Ryabogin, D., *A Lemma of Nakajima and Süss on convex bodies* , AMM **122** (2015), No. 9, pp. 890-893.

Department of Mathematics, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, USA
E-mail address: smyroshn@kent.edu

Department of Mathematics, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, USA
E-mail address: ryabogin@math.kent.edu